

25X1X4

I. OFFICIAL STATEMENTS

1. We see today...in Hungary, both human dignity and freedom outraged and the force of modern arms used to suppress peoples and to gain political objectives. The old colonial methods which we had thought in our ignorance belonged to the mere unenlightened age are revived and practiced. In other parts of world also, movements for freedom are crushed by superior might.

(Nehru Speech to UNESCO in New Delhi, 5 November 1956)

2. The Indian Ambassador in Moscow, K.P.S. Menon, called at the Soviet Foreign Office during the weekend and handed over a note expressing India's concern and distress at developments in Hungary, it was authoritatively learned here tonight. It is understood a Soviet reply to the note was on the lines of the Moscow Radio report attributing the large-scale disturbances and bloodshed in Hungary to "reactionary elements."

(New Delhi Reuters 5 November 1956)

3. Addressing the All-India Congress Committee before it concluded its 3-day session at Beliaghata, Calcutta, November 11, Jawaharlal Nehru said about Hungary: "We have been deeply grieved at what has happened in Hungary--killing and all that--that brought infinite misery to the people of Hungary and Budapest. People in large parts of Hungary are starving and not having the necessities of life. One's sympathy goes out to them."

(Delhi, Information Service of India) (12 November 1956)

4. New Delhi--The Prime Ministers of India, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia said in a joint statement today that "Soviet forces should be withdrawn from Hungary speedily and the Hungarian people left free to decide their own future." The statement followed a 2-day meeting among the four Asian leaders here.

(Reuters, London, 14 November 1956)

5. In regard to Hungary, the situation was obscure for some days and it was only gradually that the story of the tragic events that have taken place there became known. From the very beginning, we made it clear that in our opinion the people of Hungary should be allowed to determine their own future according to their wishes and that foreign forces should be withdrawn.

(Information Service of India, Delhi)

6. Foreign forces should be removed and the people of Hungary should be allowed, should be given the opportunity to determine their future...

"I think not in Budapest but in Hungary and within 3 or 4 days Soviet forces returned and in far greater mechanized power. There were big conflicts in Budapest which were ultimately suppressed by the Soviet Armed Forces. Some people say that even while the Soviet forces were withdrawing from Budapest Oct. 29 or 30, the actual Soviet Army had come across the frontier and that this was not-- if I may use the words--bona fide withdrawal at all.

Anyhow the fact remains that the Soviet forces came back and there was a major conflict in which a fairly large number of Hungarians suffered as they fought very bravely. And it is possible that the Hungarian Army itself was on the side of the Hungarian people and in the initial stages the Soviets also suffered fairly considerably, though naturally in lesser numbers.

It is not at the present moment of any very great importance that we should know the details of this. The major fact stands out that the majority of the people of Hungary wanted a change--political, economic or whatever the changes were--and actually rose in insurrection after the demonstrations to achieve it, but ultimately they were suppressed.

(Nehru Speech to Lower House, 19 November 1956)

7. In Rajya Sabha debate 3-4 December, Nehru repeated the thesis that the Hungarian "democratization" process had been reversed owing to Soviet fears of the spreading of Middle East hostilities; he expressed his belief in the popular character of the Hungarian uprising, which he termed an "upheaval against Soviet forces sent therein and called for withdrawal of the Soviet forces. (6 Dec 1956)

8. New Delhi--Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru today flatly condemned the Government of Hungarian Premier János Kádár for having broken its commitments regarding the fate of former Premier Imre Nagy. Nehru took this stand in a speech opening the foreign policy debate in the Indian Upper House.

Nehru said it was "most unfortunate" that the Kádár Government had not allowed UN observers or Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld to enter Hungary. He advocated the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country and said that the Hungarian people should be allowed to determine their own future.

(UPI, Paris Radioteletype in English to the Americas, 3 Dec. 56.)

9. New Delhi--Indian Prime Minister Nehru today said he was sorry the Hungarian Government was not accessible to admitting UN observers into Hungary. No question of sovereignty was involved in this, he added.

Nehru, who was dealing with the latest situation in Hungary in the course of his reply to a foreign affairs debate in the Rajya Sabha, said that the Hungarian Government did not want the Secretary General of the United Nations to come to Hungary in terms of any UN resolution but as the Chief Executive of the United Nations. The Government had said that the admission of observers would be an infringement of their sovereignty.

"I am sorry they did not go much further and they did not admit observers because in this matter there is no question of sovereignty. It is a question of the good name of a country. Charges are made about deportations. We have been told and we have been given solemn assurances--both by Hungary and the Soviet Union--that there have been no deportations," he added.

Referring to the case of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, Nehru said he could not see how the treatment given to him by the Hungarian Government could be explained away. The fact of assurances about him being...or the Hungarian Government being not able to give him protection stood out. He hoped Nagy "will come back soon to Hungary." He also hoped that despite all the tragedies that had occurred, the democratization process would not be reversed.

(Bombay, PTI, in English Horse to Tokyo, 4 December 1956)

10. The Hungarian Foreign Minister's announcement in New York that his Government would permit Mr. Hammarskjold to visit Budapest on Dec. 16 aroused hopes that Hungary was returning to normal after weeks of bloodshed, strife, and (massive?) oppression by Soviet troops. The subsequent curt statement from Budapest that no permission had been given to the UN Secretary General to visit Hungary has therefore been received with the greatest surprise and dismay.

The United Nations has been openly and rudely flouted, not so much by Mr. Kadar's Government, which is clearly an imposed regime, but by the Soviet Union which stands behind it.

... the indignation of the world must turn on the continuance of Soviet intervention in Hungary. A new danger threatens here, and the Soviet Union must realize that its intransigence can provoke a crisis for the United Nations that might undermine the great moral and political stature it has gained in ending the war in Egypt. A failure of the United Nations after the recent success it has had would revive the cold war with a new and dangerous intensity.

That Soviet repression continues in Hungary is amply proved by the latest reports of Russian tanks being employed to break up peaceful demonstrations by women in Budapest.

As Mr. Nehru said in Parliament a few days ago, the inference that will be drawn from refusal of the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to allow UN observers into Hungary will be that there is something to hide. It will mean that deportations have taken place, that the (secret?) abduction of the former Premier, Mr. Imre Nagy, by the Russians is true, and that the total incapability of the Kadar Government is all too apparent.

(Weekly Review of Current Affairs, Delhi, in English to Southeast Asia, Australia and New Zealand, 7 December 1956)

11. Nehru said that according to the Indian Ambassador to Hungary, K.P.S. Menon, the atmosphere in Budapest at this time was reminiscent of the civil disobedience days in India. Nehru stated that K.P.S. Menon had reported that there was "a considerable measure of passive resistance" now in Budapest, though there was no serious fighting.

According to reports received from Menon and Dr. Khosla, the Prime Minister's special representative, "About 25,000 Hungarians and some 7,000 Russians, most of them probably war of the armed forces, died in the fighting." Nehru said that according to Menon the damage to Budapest was like the damage caused in wartime.

There was no doubt, Nehru stated, that the revolution in Hungary was what was called a national one, a widespread one. India's Ambassadors said that there was an element in it "which might be called counterrevolutionary or reactionary. There were elements which came from the outside, too, but those formed a small part. It was a national movement in which the great majority of industrial workers and students took part in the city of Budapest and elsewhere. That is a basic fact."

Nehru briefly touched upon events in Hungary up to the return of Soviet forces into Budapest after the initial withdrawal on October 30 and said that their return was in large numbers. Then the "other aspect of the great tragedy in Hungary and Budapest took place." There were various estimates of the number of people killed in these shootings. It is difficult to have any accurate estimate. But from such information as we have received, it would appear that about 25,000 Hungarians died and about 7,000 Russians died in that fighting.

Nehru said that the Government's special instructions to Menon and Khosla were that they should speak to the Hungarian Government about the visit of the Secretary General of the United Nations and... (several words uncopyable--Ed.). (They had long?) talks with Hungarian Prime Minister Kadar and others and presented their viewpoints with such argument and force as they could.

Kadar informed them that the Hungarian Government had no objection to the visit of the Secretary General, but that it would take place later, though no date was fixed. But the Government objected strongly to UN observers going there, as they considered such a visit an infringement of Hungarian sovereignty.

12. New Delhi--Nehru said in the Rajya Sabha today that V.K. Krishna Menon had contended in the United Nations that Soviet intervention in Hungary was not "a case of their intervention according to treaty obligations, because there was no coup d'etat."

Menon had argued, the Prime Minister said, that there were various defensive alliances which had permitted foreign forces to be placed in various countries. India did not agree with this position. According to some alliances, it might be justified in a strictly legal way to say that the alliances permit troops to be in a country and permit them to be utilized in a coup d'etat. Menon pointed out that what happened in Hungary was a national uprising and not a coup. This was a perfectly legitimate argument, and it strengthened the main contention that Soviet forces should be withdrawn from Hungary.

"It was not even a case of their intervention according to treaty obligations, because there was no coup. That was the burden of Menon's argument," Nehru declared.

Nehru was making the statement in reply to a query made by Dr. H.N. Kunzru yesterday. Kunzru had referred to this statement attributed to Menon in his speech at the General Assembly of the United Nations: "The only justification (for Soviet intervention--PTI), if there was one, would have been for Soviet forces to have been called to the aid of the civil power in conditions where there was an attempt at coup d'etat." Kunzru wanted to know if Menon had the Government of India's authority to make this statement.

Nehru said that according to the Indian Ambassador to Hungary, K.P.S. Menon, the atmosphere in Budapest at this time was reminiscent of the civil disobedience days in India. Nehru said that K.P.S. Menon had reported that there was "a considerable measure of passive resistance" now in Budapest, though there was no serious fighting.

According to reports received from Menon and Dr. Khosla, the Prime Minister's special representative, "About 25,000 Hungarians and some 7,000 Russians, most of them probably men of the armed forces, died in the fighting." Nehru said that according to Menon the damage to Budapest was like the damage caused in wartime.

(Bombay, PTI, in English Morse to Tokyo, 13 December 1956)

13. In his first foreign policy statement delivered at Indore at the close of discussion on election manifesto on 6 January, Nehru indicated concern that the lesson of...Hungary was not leading to a new alternative to the cold war. He stressed that events in...Hungary indicated that no power can establish rule through the use of force on other countries because of opposition of world opinion. While events are saddening, he said, they also create hope for achieving peace through other means. He added that "some people are looking toward the sword." He contended that "if any big power brandishes the sword it follows that the other big power is forced to exercise restraint since their strength is apparent and brandishing only created fear."

In his second speech, delivered after adoption of foreign policy resolution and prior to adjournment of final sessions on 6 January, Nehru dealt with India's policy on Hungary and Pakistan. He reiterated earlier point that recent events have shown futility of force, and the need for a new approach. He expressed sorrow over continued sword brandishing by "some people." He also stated that the important thing in Hungary was to contribute to a solution in favor of the people.... He added that India desired withdrawal of foreign troops in Hungary....

(Indian Radio Commentator)

14. Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru used the phrase "Communist aggression" for the first time today to describe the Soviet attack on Hungary....

Earlier in the day Mr. Nehru said the "silver lining" of the Hungarian case was that it had removed many "curtains" and enabled the world to see "reality."

Ironically, although Mr. Nehru used his strongest language to describe Soviet intervention in Hungary, his party's resolution on the case calls for the removal of "foreign" forces rather than Soviet forces. Mr. Nehru said that one reason for the choice of words was that there might be other forces in the country.

(Nehru Speech to Congress Party at Indore, 6 January 1957)

15. Prime Minister Nehru called today for "foreign forces" to leave Hungary and let the people of the nation enjoy the rights of self-determination.

Mr. Nehru said Hungary had seen a true "national uprising" with an unfortunate end because of two "external factors."

First, he said, was that the country's national forces were "crushed" by Soviet troops, and second, that the timing of the Israeli-Anglo-French attack on Egypt did not help the Hungarian cause.

(Nehru Statement During Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs in New Delhi, 23 July 1957)

II. OPPOSITION (SOCIALIST) STATEMENTS

1. Bombay--The Praja Socialist Party, one of the main opposition parties in India, today described the use of Soviet forces in Hungary and the threat to use them in Poland as "most reprehensible."

A statement issued in Bombay by the party secretariat asked the Indian Government to call upon the Soviet Union to "abstain from this flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of these nations in pursuance of its obligation as a signatory to Panch Shila." The statement said it was by a "courageous step" that India could help the people of Poland and Hungary in their struggle for freedom and insure universal acceptance and observance of Panch Shila.

"While no one can question the right of these Nations to maintain close relations with the USSR or, for that matter, with any other nation," the statement added, "when these 'ties of friendship' have to be maintained with tanks and machine guns they generate into chains of subjugation. We wish to remind the Soviet leaders that they have solemnly affirmed their adherence to Panch Shila which demands strict nonintervention in the internal affairs of another nation."

The latest events in Poland and Hungary, it said, were but part of an "inexorable process" in operation. "The specter of freedom is haunting Eastern Europe. The process can be traced back to the Berlin rising of June 17, 1956."

The statement also referred to Algeria and drew attention to certain similarities between events in Eastern Europe and Algeria. In both cases, it said, regimes which have monopolized the use of words like "liberty" and "equality" are relying upon "naked force to crush the people's attempt to realize these words."

(PTI, Bombay, in English Morse to Tokyo, 26 October 1956)

2. For many days there was not even a whisper heard from New Delhi about Hungary. Then one fine morning the papers reported Mr. Nehru's chief adviser on foreign policy, Mr. Krishna Menon, as having stated that the Hungarian question was a domestic affair of the Hungarian people. It was an astounding statement that left me aghast.

The Russian army swooped down and set the seal of doom upon that unfortunate country. Prime Minister Imre Nagy was arrested and in true Stalinist fashion a stooge was put in his place to carry out the bidding of the invaders.

Finally came the crowning piece of this shameful story, namely India's opposition to the second (UN) resolution on Hungary and Mr. Menon's speech of the 9th (November). A more preverse and false view of the situation could have hardly been imagined. As an Indian I hang down my head in shame.

What happened in Hungary is not at all difficult to understand. As the process of de-Stalinization went on, Communists the world over gathered courage and began to assert their independence of Moscow. Stalin's stooges fell in disgrace and his victims began to be rehabilitated. Moscow after its own drastic exposure of Stalin's tyranny, could not check this process even though it tried to do so as in Poland, where Khrushchev himself had tried personally to intervene. But there was a limit beyond which Moscow was not prepared to let this assertion of National freedom go. In Hungary this is exactly what happened. Imre Nagy, impelled almost hourly by the rising tide of the popular revolution, renounced the Communist monopoly of power and formed a national-front government; promised free elections as soon as possible; repudiated the hated Warsaw treaty; proclaimed the neutrality of Hungary; asked the UN to order the Russians to quit and to honour the new proclaimed neutrality. (Press Statement Issued by Jayaprakash Narayan, 11 November 1956)

3. New Delhi--India's neutralism has been destroyed by the stand of India's representative in the United Nations, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, the secretary of the Socialist Parliamentary group, said today at a press conference. "Mr. Menon's vote against the Italian resolution on Hungary remains unexplainable because one does not know why India's representative acted like this without consulting the Asiatic group that abstained," Mr. Gurupadaswamy added. He affirmed that his party favored free elections in Hungary, under the control of the United Nations if necessary.

(AFP, Paris, 15 November 1956)

4. Bombay--An Indian "Committee for Solidarity with Hungary" was formed today by Indian Socialist leader Jai Prakesh Narain. Addressing a meeting under the auspices of the Press Guild of India, Narain criticized the Indian Government and especially India's U.N. representative, Krishna Menon, for their stand on Hungary. The Socialist leader demanded that Menon should be replaced as the head of the U.N. delegation.

Referring to fears that if India criticized Russia it might incur the enmity of Soviet Russia, Narain said: "If the price of friendship is such that we have to ditto everything that a friendly country does, then it is better not to have friendship with that country at all."

AFP, Paris, Radioteletype in English to the Americas, 15 November 1956)

5. Jaya Prakash Narayan, Socialist leader, quoted in November 17, 1956, Madras Press, as saying: Present Hungarian Prime Minister is Russian stooge. Nehru is being misinformed by Russians.

6. Ganga Saren Deva, Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party in Bangalore on 25 November 1956, said "This Soviet intervention is a sad commentary on the 'new look' in their foreign policy which the Soviet statesmen profess." The indifference of the Govt to the "atrocities that are being perpetrated by the Soviet Union is definitely deplorable."

7. A motion was presented at the Praja Socialist Party's National Conference at Bangalore on 25-28 November 1956, which stated that the PSP Conference "salutes the heroic efforts of the Hungarian people for national liberation and political self-determination." The "brave and tragic struggle" of the Hungarians "has finally torn the veil from the Russian occupation of East European countries and has exposed that rule as imperialist based on naked use of force." (4 Jan 1957)

8. Bangalore (South India), 26 November: During its meeting today, the national conference of India's Praja Socialist Party discussed a resolution on East Europe, viewing Hungary as a "test case of freedom." It appealed to the Government of India to reconsider its attitude toward the Kadar Government. The Indian Government, it said, should not recognize "that imposed regime" as the legitimate Government of Hungary.

In his presidential address to the conference yesterday, Ganga Saran Sinha, a Party member, said about the situation in Hungary: "Soviet intervention is a sad commentary on the new look in their foreign policy which Soviet statemen profess. It clearly proves they cannot be trusted to adhere to the principles of Panch Shila."

(Bombay, PTI, in English Morse to Tokyo, 27 November 1956)

9. There is the question of the involvement of the Soviet troops in the internal affairs of Hungary. There can be no doubt as to where my Government stands with regard to such an involvement. We have always opposed the intervention of foreign armed forces in the internal affairs of a country, as it is contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the entire foreign policy of my country rests.... Yugoslavia has always strongly advocated the line of strict noninterference in Hungary's internal affairs and of full respect for its sovereign rights. The less interference, from whatever source, there is in their internal affairs, the better it will be for the Hungarian people and for the peace of the world. The Hungarian people are surely mature enough to settle their own problems in accordance with their interests and their wishes.

(Speech by Jozs Brilej, Yugoslav Delegate to UN, during UN Debate on Hungary, 8 November 1956.)

10. There is no point now in investigating who fired the first shot. The Army was called out by Gero. It was a fatal mistake to call the Soviet Army at a time when the demonstrations were still in progress. It is a great mistake to call in the Army of another country even if there is some shooting. This angered the people even more, and thus a spontaneous revolt broke out....

Many people are now asking why the second Soviet intervention took place. It is clear, and we have said so and will continue to say it, that we are against interference and the use of foreign armed forces.

Which was not the lesser evil? There could be either chaos, civil war, counter-revolution, and a new world war, or the intervention of Soviet troops which were there. The former would be a catastrophe and the latter a mistake.... This error was, unfortunately, a result of their idea that military power solves everything. And it does not solve everything. Just look how a bare-handed and poorly armed people offers fierce resistance when it has one goal--to free itself and to be independent. It is no longer interested in the kind of independence it will gain, in whether there will be restored a bourgeois and reactionary system, but only that it should be nationally independent. It was this idea that prevailed among the people. Naturally, I can now say only that the first thing was the worst that could have happened and the second, the intervention of Soviet troops, was also bad....

After my report, you can ask questions because I have perhaps not made everything clear. But you can rest assured that we have never advised them to go ahead and use the army. We never gave such advice and could not do so even in the present crisis. In this grave situation we can tell them nothing except that they should take care to correct their old mistakes. That is the crux of the matter. Therefore, we should combat those rumors in our country which see in the Soviet intervention a purely interventionist act. That is not correct. I, comrades, am deeply convinced of this.

I am deeply convinced that the bloodshed in Hungary and those dreadful sacrifices made by the Hungarian people will have a positive effect and that a little light will reach the eyes of the comrades in the Soviet Union, even those Stalinist elements, and that they will see that it is no longer possible to do things in this way. It is our tragedy--the tragedy of all of us--that socialism has been dealt such a terrible blow. It has been compromised....

(Tito Speech to Party Meeting Held at Pula, 11 November 1956.)

III. PRESS COMMENT

1. ...The Russians, if they are wise, should comply with the Hungarian demand even before the U.N. makes any move. It is clear that they have made themselves hateful to the Hungarians.

(Hindu, 3 November 1956)

2. Communism had been restored to Hungary, by the might of the Soviet armed forces, by a brutal aggression, which has crushed the people who sought to free themselves from the repression of Soviet Russia.... This represents one of the greatest betrayals of any people, and a new Government is being imposed on Hungary, pressing the people again into a state of servitude, and in taking action once again are heard the old tirades against the capitalist countries, against those who have endeavored to free themselves from a hateful domination, a degrading, debasing position... Hungary is a repetition of the East German affair of three years ago.

(Mail, 5 November 1956)

3. ...Non-Communists seem to have even hoped that they would have a voice in the governance of the country. The determined effort made by the Russian armed forces to displace the Imre Nagy Government by a more amenable one under Janos Kadar should dispel all such hopes once for all; the Soviet seems to be determined that no regime which is not Communist shall exist in the satellite countries. In other words, the people in these countries do not have a chance of voting a government of their choice into power; or to displace it by democratic means when they are dissatisfied with it.

(Hindu, 6 November 1956)

4. ...Looking at the events in Hungary, the incidents have assumed the familiar Soviet pattern. A satellite Power, subordinate to communist imperialism, ventured out in an act of rebellion against the paramount authority of Moscow. As a consequence, the vast machinery of the Red Army sprang into operation...

(Swatantra, 10 November 1956)

5. "What is happening in Hungary is not purely of internal concern to the government now functioning in Budapest." The paper adds: "The Warsaw Pact, which was set up in opposition to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is meant to protect Russia and her allies from external aggression. Events in Hungary have not been

precipitated by any external aggression, nor does a people's movement result from external machinations. It is obvious that the people of Hungary cannot express their opinions about the government they want as long as Russian troops stay there as a bulwark of the present regime." The paper concludes: "The immediate task, however, is to rush all possible aid to the people who have suffered during the recent fighting."

(Hindu, 11 November 1956)

6. ...It is quite apparent that the Kadar Government is in power only because the Soviet has put it there... What is happening in Hungary is not purely of internal concern to the Government now functioning in Budapest... Events in Hungary have not been precipitated by any external aggression nor does the people's movement result from external machinations. It is obvious that the people of Hungary cannot express their opinions about the Government they want so long as the Russian troops stay there as the bulwark of the present regime.

(Hindu, 11 November 1956)

7. Russia was massacring innocent freedom-loving Hungarians, regardless of whether they were women and children. Russia's cruel objective is to establish the peace of the grave in Hungary. This has been condemned all over the world. The Prime Minister has also condemned the Russian aggression, although perhaps belatedly.

(Jana Vani, 12 November 1956)

8. Developments in Hungary taken with those in Poland have shown that Soviet policy may be prepared to consider self-government with safeguards, but certainly not independence for junior members of the Communist alliance. This is the clear moral of the re-entry in force of Soviet military power into Hungary after earlier signs of withdrawal. The United Nations must continue to pursue all constructive and constitutional processes open to it under the Charter to deal with issues raised by Soviet conduct in Hungary.

(Hindustan Times, 12 November 1956)

9. ...The troubles in Hungary are a sign that it is not alone Asian and African nations that are threatened by resurgent colonialism... There can be no grave infringement of Panch Shila than the stationing of the army of one nation in the territory of another, whether in pursuance of treaties or through the assertion of superior force.

(Indian Express, 16 November 1956)

10. To those who have been much perturbed by the continuing presence of foreign troops in Hungary, the news that Hungarians are being deported from their country "on a substantial scale" will cause greater concern... There is no reason to disbelieve the truth of these reports.

(Hindu, 17 November 1956)

11. India behaved disgracefully at the UNO in failing to support the resolution condemning Russian aggression in Hungary... There is no doubt whatever that the events in Hungary are open violations of the vaunted principles of Panch Shila, and the author of the new doctrine, intended to promote peace and unity in the world, has not only ignored the violations but has set up a double standard of morality which cuts at the very root of his doctrine.

(Swatantra, 17 November 1956)

12. Both in Hungary and in the Middle East, the source of the trouble lies in an attempt to revive colonialism. And in both, the issue is freedom.

(Indian Express, 19 November 1956)

13. What Russia has done in Hungary is quite contrary to the Panch Shila principles, of which it claims to be a staunch adherent.

(Nava India [Tamil],)

14. Nehru's statement (Nov. 19) proves that he is not partial towards Russia as some allege. Why is Khrushchev, who signed the Panch Shila, suppressing the freedom of another country?

(Tamil Nadu [Tamil], 21 November 1956)

15. Russian action in Hungary deserves universal condemnation... The very fact that Nehru has suggested that UN observers be sent to Hungary to study the situation implies that he too feels that this is no longer a domestic issue... We now have good reasons to doubt the genuineness of Russian statements on peace and disarmament.

(Nava India [Tamil], 22 November 1956)

16. The government's attitude towards Hungary is contrary to the positive policy of neutral followed by India. It is difficult for people with some conscience to understand the argument of Krishna Menon or the stand taken by the GOI. The UN is not concerned about the domestic quarrel in Hungary but about Russian intervention in it.

(Deepika [Tamil],)

17. The policy advocated by Nehru and Krishna Menon will undermine India's prestige. The aggression against Hungary was midnight poisoning.

(Jagrithi [Telugu])

18. There is no truth in Nehru's description of the Hungarian plight as civil war. In what way can Nehru justify Russian armed intervention in Hungary? If there were civil war in India and Russia or China occupied this country on the invitation of the CPI, would Nehru tolerate it?

(Kvatantra [Telugu])

19. It is surprising that despite the UN resolution and the opinions expressed by Nehru and the US President, Russia still wants to make the world believe that what is happening in Hungary is a domestic affair... "If Russia is not going to withdraw its troops from Hungary, we have to call it a land-thirst imperialistic nation."

(Tamil Nadu)

20. Soviet kidnapping of Nagy evoked sharp criticism in the Indian press, which called the action "a political blunder of the first order."

(2 December 1956)

21. The Times of India, published simultaneously in Bombay and Delhi, describes Hungary's refusal to receive Mr. Hammarskjold on December 16 as a further affront to the United Nations and one that suggests that Budapest has no intention of exposing its affairs to the impartial scrutiny of the international organization.

This equivocal attitude toward the Secretary General, the Times goes on, is all the more reprehensible since Mr. Hammarskjold is not a servant of the UN General Assembly, but an organ of the United Nations whose powers and responsibilities are clearly defined in the Charter.

If Budapest, as it claims, has nothing to hide, it should in its own interest welcome an impartial investigation by UN observers, and thereby establish its good faith in the eyes of the entire world. It is possible, however, that any such investigation will reveal something very much more substantial than ... the interest of the puppet regime in Budapest. Quite apart from establishing the fact of large-scale deportations, it would expose the degree to which the Kadar Government is dependent on Soviet support and, conversely, the degree in which the people of Hungary are independent of either.

(Weekly Review of the Indian Press, Delhi, in English to Southeast Asia, Australia, and New Zealand; 10 December 1956)

ANNEX A

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES OF INDIAN OFFICIALS

1. Nehru Speech to UNESCO in New Delhi, 5 November 1956

We see today ... in Hungary, both human dignity and freedom outraged and the force of modern arms used to suppress peoples and to gain political objectives. The old colonial methods which we had thought in our ignorance belonged to the more unenlightened age are revived and practiced. In other parts of world also, movements for freedom are crushed by superior might.

2. Press Statement Issued by Jayaprakash Narayan, Leader of the Praja Socialist Party for Solidarity with Hungary, 11 November 1956

For many days there was not even a whisper heard from New Delhi about Hungary. Then one fine morning the papers reported Mr. Nehru's chief adviser on foreign policy, Mr. Krishna Menon, as having stated that the Hungarian question was a domestic affair of the Hungarian people. It was an astounding statement that left me aghast.

The Russian army swooped down and set the seal of doom upon that unfortunate country. Prime Minister Imre Nagy was arrested and in true Stalinist fashion a stooge was put in his place to carry out the bidding of the invaders.

Finally came the crowning piece of this shameful story, namely India's opposition to the second (UN) resolution on Hungary and Mr. Menon's speech of the 9th (November). A more perverse and false view of the situation could have hardly been imagined. As an Indian I hang down my head in shame.

What happened in Hungary is not at all difficult to understand. As the process of de-Stalinization went on, Communists the world over gathered courage and began to assert their independence of Moscow. Stalin's stooges fell in disgrace and his victims began to be rehabilitated. Moscow, after its own drastic exposure of Stalin's tyranny, could not check this process even though it tried to do so as in Poland, where Khrushchov himself had tried personally to intervene. But there was a limit beyond which Moscow was not prepared to let this assertion of National freedom go. In Hungary this is exactly what happened. Imre Nagy, impelled almost hourly by the rising tide of the popular revolution, renounced the Communist monopoly of power and formed a national-front government; promised free elections as soon as possible; repudiated the hated Warsaw treaty; proclaimed the neutrality of Hungary; asked the UN to order the Russians to quit and to honour the new proclaimed neutrality.

3. Nehru Speech to Lower House, 12 November 1956

Foreign forces should be removed and the people of Hungary should be allowed, should be given the opportunity to determine their future....

I think not in Budapest but in Hungary and within 3 or 4 days Soviet forces returned and in far greater mechanized power. There were big conflicts in Budapest which were ultimately suppressed by the Soviet Armed Forces. Some people say that even while the Soviet Forces were withdrawing from Budapest Oct. 29 or 30, the actual Soviet Army had come across the frontier and that this was not--if I may use the words--bona fide withdrawal at all.

Anyhow the fact remains that the Soviet forces came back and there was a major conflict in which a fairly large number of Hungarians suffered as they fought very bravely. And it is possible that the Hungarian Army itself was on the side of the Hungarian people and in the initial stages

the Soviets also suffered fairly considerably, though naturally in lesser numbers.

It is not at the present moment of any very great importance that we should know the details of this. The major fact stands out that the majority of the people of Hungary wanted a change--political, economic or whatever the changes were--and actually rose in insurrection after the demonstrations to achieve it, but ultimately they were suppressed.

4. Nehru Speech to Upper House, 13 December 1956

Nehru said that according to the Indian Ambassador to Hungary, K.P.S. Menon, the atmosphere in Budapest at this time was reminiscent of the civil disobedience days in India. Nehru stated that K.P.S. Menon had reported that there was "a considerable measure of passive resistance" now in Budapest, though there was no serious fighting.

According to reports received from Menon and Dr. Khosla, the Prime Minister's special representative, "About 25,000 Hungarians and some 7,000 Russians, most of them probably men of the armed forces, died in the fighting." Nehru said that according to Menon the damage to Budapest was like the damage caused in wartime.

There was no doubt, Nehru stated, that the revolution in Hungary was what was called a national one, a widespread one. India's Ambassadors said that there was an element in it "which might be called counterrevolutionary or reactionary. There were elements which came from the outside, too, but these formed a small part. It was a national movement in which the great majority of industrial workers and students took part in the city of Budapest and elsewhere. That is a basic fact."

Nehru briefly touched upon events in Hungary up to the return of Soviet forces into Budapest after the initial withdrawal on October 30 and said that their return was in large numbers. Then the "other aspect of the great tragedy in Hungary and Budapest

took place. There were various estimates of the number of people killed in these shootings. It is difficult to have any accurate estimate. But from such information as we have received, it would appear that about 25,000 Hungarians died and about 7,000 Russians died in that fighting.

Nehru said that the Government's special instructions to Menon and Khosla were that they should speak to the Hungarian Government about the visit of the Secretary General of the United Nations and ... (several words uncopyable--Ed.). (They had long?) talks with Hungarian Prime Minister Kadar and others and presented their viewpoints with such argument and force as they could.

Kadar informed them that the Hungarian Government had no objection to the visit of the Secretary General, but that it would take place later, though no date was fixed. But the Government objected strongly to UN observers going there, as they considered such a visit an infringement of Hungarian sovereignty.

5. Nehru Speech to Congress Party at Indore, 6 January 1957

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru used the phrase "Communist aggression" for the first time today to describe the Soviet attack on Hungary....

Earlier in the day Mr. Nehru said the "silver lining" of the Hungarian case was that it had removed many "curtains" and enabled the world to see "reality."

Ironically, although Mr. Nehru used his strongest language to describe Soviet intervention in Hungary, his party's resolution on the case calls for the removal of "foreign" forces rather than Soviet forces. Mr. Nehru said that one reason for the choice of words was that there might be other forces in the country.

6. Nehru Statement During Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs in New Delhi, 23 July 1957

Prime Minister Nehru called today for "foreign forces" to leave Hungary and let the people of the nation enjoy the rights of self-determination.

Mr. Nehru said Hungary had seen a true "national uprising" with an unfortunate end because of two "external factors."

First, he said, was that the country's national forces were "crushed" by Soviet troops, and second, that the timing of the Israeli-Anglo-French attack on Egypt did not help the Hungarian cause.

ANNEX B

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES OF YUGOSLAV OFFICIALS

ANNEX B

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES OF YUGOSLAV OFFICIALS

1. Tito Speech to the Leadership of the Hungarian Workers Party, 28 October 1956

The Yugoslav League of Communists and all working people of our country have a profound admiration for all those progressive people in neighboring Hungary who in these days have made great efforts to turn this tragic struggle into an era of revival and to defend the socialist future of their people. For this reason the Yugoslav public unanimously hails the establishment of the new state and political leadership and the declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of Hungary of October 28 of this month. The essential parts of the political platform of the new Hungarian political and state leadership, such as the democratization of public life, the introduction of workers' self-management and democratic self-government in general, the settlement of relations between socialist countries on the basis of equality and respect for sovereignty, taking the initiative for negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet troops, as well as the realistic appraisal of the nature of events in Hungary which has been made in the above-mentioned declaration of the Government, are proof that the policy of the present state and political leadership and the genuine socialist aspirations of the Hungarian working people have merged.

2. Speech by Jozs Brilej, Yugoslav Delegate to UN, during UN Debate on Hungary, 8 November 1956

There is the question of the involvement of the Soviet troops in the internal affairs of Hungary. There can be no doubt as to where my Government stands with regard to such an involvement. We have always opposed the intervention of foreign armed forces in the internal affairs of a country,

as it is contrary to the fundamental principles upon which the entire foreign policy of my country rests.... Yugoslavia has always strongly advocated the line of strict noninterference in Hungary's internal affairs and of full respect for its sovereign rights. The less interference, from whatever source, there is in their internal affairs, the better it will be for the Hungarian people and for the peace of the world. The Hungarian people are surely mature enough to settle their own problems in accordance with their interests and their wishes.

3. Tito Speech to Party Meeting Held at Pula, 11 November 1956

There is no point now in investigating who fired the first shot. The Army was called out by Gero. It was a fatal mistake to call the Soviet Army at a time when the demonstrations were still in progress. It is a great mistake to call in the Army of another country to teach a lesson to the people of that country, even if there is some shooting. This angered the people even more, and thus a spontaneous revolt broke out....

Many people are now asking why the second Soviet intervention took place. It is clear, and we have said so and will continue to say it, that we are against interference and the use of foreign armed forces. Which was not the lesser evil? There could be either chaos, civil war, counter-revolution, and a new world war, or the intervention of Soviet troops which were there. The former would be a catastrophe and the latter a mistake.... This error was, unfortunately, a result of their idea that military power solves everything. And it does not solve everything. Just look how a bare-handed and poorly armed people offers fierce resistance when it has one goal--to free itself and to be independent. It is no longer interested in the kind of independence it will gain, in whether there will be restored a bourgeois and reactionary system, but only that it should be

nationally independent. It was this idea that prevailed among the people. Naturally, I can now say only that the first thing was the worst that could have happened and the second, the intervention of Soviet troops, was also bad....

After my report, you can ask questions because I have perhaps not made everything clear. But you can rest assured that we have never advised them to go ahead and use the army. We never gave such advice and could not do so even in the present crisis. In this grave situation we can tell them nothing except that they should take care to correct their old mistakes. That is the crux of the matter. Therefore, we should combat those rumors in our country which see in the Soviet intervention a purely interventionist act. That is not correct. I, comrades, am deeply convinced of this.

I am deeply convinced that the bloodshed in Hungary and those dreadful sacrifices made by the Hungarian people will have a positive effect and that a little light will reach the eyes of the comrades in the Soviet Union, even those Stalinist elements, and that they will see that it is no longer possible to do things in this way. It is our tragedy--the tragedy of all of us--that socialism has been dealt such a terrible blow. It has been compromised....

4. Speech by Edward Kardelj, Vice President of the Federal Executive Council, at Joint Session of the Two Councils of the Federal People's Assembly, 6 December 1956

It would be a great mistake and illusion to believe that with the final form of the Nagy government as it was before Nov. 4, the revolutionary clashes in Hungary took their normal course. On the contrary, the battle for the final social and political form in Hungary had then only begun, and no honest person could guess where it would end.

It was, of course, more likely that socialist forces would have succeeded in preserving the socialist economic basis of Hungarian society. In any case,

the working class would have to shed much more blood and live through many more disappointments before it could, through struggle and defeat, gain experience which would enable it empirically to achieve a new democratic mechanism of the socialist social system.

However, a serious defeat of the working class and socialism could not be excluded. Thus Hungary would be the cause of a very dangerous international clash. It was in this light that we regarded the second Soviet intervention in Hungary. We are, of course, in principle against any foreign intervention regardless of source not only because of the right of nations to settle their internal differences themselves, but also because intervention, when it is a matter of social crisis, never solves problems. It can only postpone settlement for a certain time and simultaneously intensify problems.

In this sense, Soviet intervention in Hungary in itself can do nothing to settle internal differences. However, it will certainly increase tension and result in more serious consequences if it acts as a brake on the settlement of problems of the internal political system, which definitely must be settled if the development of socialism in Hungary is to be secured.

ANNEX C

EXCERPTS FROM UN SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON HUNGARY DEALING
WITH ATTEMPTS TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS IN HUNGARY

ANNEX C

EXCERPTS FROM UN SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON HUNGARY DEALING
WITH ATTEMPTS TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS IN HUNGARY

1. In the Introduction to Chapter I, Organization and Functions (para 4), the Committee expressed its regrets that "owing to the attitude of the Hungarian Government, it has not been in a position to establish and maintain direct observation in Hungary, as enjoined by the General Assembly resolution.
2. In Chapter I, Section 5, Attempts to Observe in Hungary and to Meet Mr. Imre Nagy:
 - "32. As stated in the Interim Report, the Committee had requested at an early stage, through the Secretary-General, that the Hungarian Government extend assistance or facilities for the Committee's work, especially with regard to the entry of the Committee and its staff within the territory of Hungary. In his reply of 5 February 1957, the Permanent Representative of Hungary informed the Secretary-General that, in the opinion of his Government, the Committee 'violates, in its function, the Charter of the United Nations,' and that 'consequently, the Hungarian Government is not in a position to permit the members of the Special Committee and its staff to enter into the territory of Hungary.'"
 - "33. In accordance with the undertaking stated in the Interim Report, the Committee renewed its request to the Hungarian Government during its stay in Europe. The Hungarian Government replied in a Note of 25 March 1957 that it maintained its position."
 - "34. On 14 March 1957, the Committee also requested the Secretary-General to inform the Government of Romania that the Committee desired to meet Mr. Imre Nagy in the interest of a full and effective performance of the functions entrusted

to it by the General Assembly. The Permanent Representative of Romania replied on 30 March that his Government considered the establishment of the Committee as contrary to the spirit and provisions of the United Nations Charter, as well as to the interests of international cooperation."

3. Under General Observations on the work of the Committee (para 44), the Committee expressed its regrets that "the refusal of the Hungarian Government and of the Government of the USSR to cooperate has prevented it from obtaining the information which those Governments are in a position to place at its disposal. The Committee would undoubtedly have profited by the data which the two Governments could have placed before it. However, in view of the comprehensive and detailed documentation and testimony which has been available, it is the opinion of the Committee that the data which might have been presented by the Government of the USSR and by the Hungarian Government would not have modified the Committee's main conclusions regarding what actually took place in Hungary, though it might possibly have changed or elaborated certain specific points in this report...."

The Committee reiterates this statement of regret in the Introduction to Chapter II (para 1) "that it was twice refused permission by Mr. Kadar's Government to enter Hungarian territory. This refusal meant, among other things, that it was denied the opportunity of obtaining first-hand information on the views of that Government."

Again in the Introduction to Chapter VII (para 3), "... the Committee regrets that ... the Governments of the USSR and of Mr. Kadar have declined to respond in any way to the request of the General Assembly for their cooperation."

4. The Committee in its Conclusions (Chapter XVII, para 1) "regrets that the attitude of the Hungarian Government has prevented it from basing its investigation on direct observation in Hungary, as required by the General Assembly resolution."